

From:
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Subject: PDE01088_SAP objection letter
Date: 15 November 2015 22:43:16

Dear Planning Inspectors,

I'm writing this letter to you to explain why the Lees City Council's site allocation plan is unsound. I also complain about how the consultation process was conducted by Leeds City Council (LCC).

The allocation plan is UNSOUND. I can read in the SAP that over 40% of sites are allocated on greenbelt or greenfield land. This is direct contradiction to the directions in Chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Surely, this national document is more important than the planing strategy document put together by the LCC.

As a reminder, here is what it says in paragraph 79 and 80:

79.

"The Government attaches great importance to Green Belt. The fundamental aim of greenbelt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence."

80.

"The Green Belt serves 5 purposes:

- * To check the unrestricted sprawl of built-up areas;
- * To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another
- * To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- * To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns;
- * To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land."

The NPPF, which I recommend for your most serious perusal, makes it very clear in paragraph 81, 82 and 83 that the Green Belts, once established, should "only be altered in exceptional circumstances" (paragraph 83).

Furthermore, the Department for Communities and Local Government, a Government body, has stressed that allocating Green Belt land to accommodate local authority housing targets can NOT be considered an exceptional circumstance.

At the very brief chance I was given to interact with someone from the LCC at the meeting in Horsforth I was told that the LCC is using their own set target as an excuse for allocating the green belt for planning in the SAP.

The fact that the LCC has come up with an unrealistic planing strategy is not an exceptional circumstance that warrants the destruction of the Green Belt, but rather an exceptional mistake by the people in the LCC who have been involved in it.

The LCC also hasn't done a comprehensive Green Belt review which makes the SAP unsound. HG2-41 is the biggest green belt site that will split the Green Belt is to be destroyed with I firmly object!

The LCC's SAP is unsound because it is not consistent with national ruling and national policy.

The NPPF states in paragraph 126 that the LCC has a statutory duty, under the provisions of S72 of the Planning Act 1990, to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving character or appearance of Conservation Areas. In none of the lengthy documents published by the LCC can I find that this has been considered.

Sites HG2-12 (4254), HG2-1, HG2-2, HG2-5, HG2-9, HG2-10 are adjoining conservation area and LCC has not carried out any assessment of the impact of building near the conservation area. This is another example that the LCC's SAP is unsound and inconsistent with national policy.

The next argument for why the SAP is unsound is that after development several communities will merge. This once more contradicts the NPPF.

HG2-41, HG2-12, HG3-2 and HG3-3 will merge Horsforth and Rawdon.

HG2-1 and HG2-2 will merge Guiseley and Menston.

Once more this is not in line with the NPPF and not even with Leeds' own Core Strategy.

The SAP is unsound and furthermore exposes inconsistencies within Leeds' core strategy, site

allocation plan and Unitary Development Plan.

This baffling inconsistency is particularly exposed on Site HG2-41. This site is Green Belt and has been identified within the Leeds Core Strategy as 'strategic green landscape' and it has been identified by Leeds as 'Special Landscape' in the Unitary Development Plan. Clearly this site must not be allocated as building land.

There are great concerns regarding site HG2-41 for 777 homes. First is that the LCC's doesn't provide a strategy of improving the public transport links and infrastructure to accommodate the 1000+ cars and busses.

Second is the LCC's dismal track record in creating a living space that will enhance the community. I have no confidence that the school on this site will ever be built or other public amenities. My concern is that there will only be houses and nothing but houses, because the LCC appears to favour developers' opinions more than the communities concerns. A developer only makes money by selling houses, not schools and will turn around to say it is not viable to built a school, as has been done in the past.

It gives the impression that the council firmly has their hands in developers pockets. I can only hope that no one from the council is accepting private benefits from any of the developers because the destruction of the Green Belt can not be undone and future generations will suffer from poor decision making or corruption of our generation.

One of the reasons for my belief that developers' interests are more important that the local residents is the shambolic community consultation.

Leeds City Council has made absolutely no effort to communicate with me about this important decision. If it wasn't for local action groups I would never have found out about this town-changing consultation. I really had to go out of my way to find out about this consultation and I feel sorry for the majority of residents who are not connected to the internet who can't access any of the documentation and information. The 1-day set-up in the mechanical institute in Horsforth was simply not enough. When I asked one of the planing people at this event why the council isn't doing more to raise awareness he said that there is no money for that, which is a remarkable statement from "the number one City in the UK". From my point of view you are the number one in pleasing housing developers, not its residents.

Another reason for why developers have a greater say than residents is through the appeals process which is only granted to the developers and not for residents. This is unjust and will result in local protests and demonstrations, if our Green Belt is being destroyed.

Kind regards,

Dr. Johannes Stanta
40 Bachelor Lane
Horsforth
Leeds
LS18 5NA

Sent from my iPhone